

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION  
PERSONNEL CLASSIFICATION DIVISION  
EFFICIENCY RATINGS ADMINISTRATION SECTION

EFFICIENCY RATING  
MANUAL



Form 3823 Revised

Effective January 1, 1944

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office  
Washington, D. C. - Price 10 cents

## FOREWORD

Efficiency ratings are periodic evaluations of work performance which indicate how effectively employees are performing their assigned duties and discharging the responsibilities delegated to them. Records of these evaluations make it possible for administrators, supervisors, and employees to know what progress is being made in accomplishing desired work results. They serve as a periodic inventory of the most important asset of an organization—its manpower.

Organizations are judged by their records of achievement. Those who are charged with the responsibility of planning programs and directing projects must know what skills and abilities must be applied to accomplish the desired results. They must also know the performance that is necessary to achieve success in their undertakings. They must be alert to the human characteristics of manpower. Praise must be given to the worker who is leading in accomplishment, and those who are weak must be encouraged and trained to do better. These requirements are fundamental whether or not efficiency ratings are used. Efficiency ratings are an aid in carrying out these requirements.

This efficiency rating system requires that administrators and supervisors apply the same knowledge they use in administration and supervision—a knowledge of the work to be done, of the way the work should be done, and of the way the work is being done, by each person in the organization. Requirements are different in different jobs, so different combinations of rating elements are provided. The worth of performance is not difficult to determine because each employee's work is measured by the requirements of his own job. The method of preparing and reviewing ratings is adapted to the administrative plan of the organization. As the first-line supervisor is directly in charge of the worker, he initiates the efficiency rating. Those responsible for reviewing the efficiency ratings are the higher administrators who control the supervisors in their regular work operations. The final review is by a committee representing the head of the department or agency.

Directors of personnel are responsible for providing the organization with manpower, with proper qualifications, in appropriate assignments, and rendering effective service. They need the benefit of current efficiency ratings to assist them in placement and training activities and in passing upon promotions, demotions, salary advancements, salary reductions, reductions in force, and dismissals for inefficiency. Directors of personnel are therefore responsible for the general administration of efficiency rating programs.

This efficiency rating system has been simplified, but no system will operate itself. Its success or failure depends upon the care and attention given to its administration. If efficiency ratings are made fairly on the basis of actual work requirements, and are discussed frankly with employees they will bring about a better understanding between workers and their supervisors and between supervisors and their superiors. No one can justly complain about honest efficiency ratings, promptly published and fairly applied. No one can defend ratings which do not meet these tests.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD-----	1
<b>PART I. THE EFFICIENCY RATING SYSTEM</b>	
SECTION 1. Employees rated and form used-----	1
SECTION 2. Kinds of ratings-----	1
SECTION 3. Official ratings—regular ratings, when made, and periods of service considered-----	1
SECTION 4. Official ratings—probational or trial period ratings, when made, and period of service considered-----	2
SECTION 5. Official ratings—special ratings, when made, and period of service considered-----	2
SECTION 6. The rating official—designation-----	2
SECTION 7. The rating official—rating responsibilities-----	3
SECTION 8. The reviewing official—designation-----	3
SECTION 9. The reviewing official—reviewing responsibilities-----	3
SECTION 10. Efficiency rating committee—designation-----	4
SECTION 11. Efficiency rating committee—responsibilities-----	4
SECTION 12. The Director of Personnel—responsibilities-----	6
<b>PART II. AIDS IN EFFICIENCY RATING ADMINISTRATION</b>	
A. Suggested check list-----	7
B. Suggested schedule for completing the regular rating program-----	8
C. A plan for conducting a meeting with rating officials-----	8
D. Suggested plan for discussion of ratings with employees-----	9
<b>APPENDIX A</b>	
Legislative and Executive authority for the Efficiency Rating System-----	12
<b>APPENDIX B</b>	
Departmental Circular No. 458-----	14
<b>EXHIBIT</b>	
Report of Efficiency Rating, Standard Form No. 51, Revised-----	18

## PART I. THE EFFICIENCY RATING SYSTEM

SECTION 1. *Employees rated and form used.*—The efficiency rating system applies to all employees paid under the compensation scales in Section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. It also applies to employees whose rates of compensation are fixed under the schedule in Executive Order No. 6746, dated June 21, 1934. Standard Form No. 51, Revised, Report of Efficiency Rating, will be used to rate the efficiency of all such employees.

SECTION 2. *Kinds of ratings.*—Efficiency ratings required under the efficiency rating system are official ratings. Official ratings have the following significance: (1) Each employee must receive notice of his rating and the rating form of each employee must be available to him for inspection; (2) they are subject to inspection by all employees; (3) they are subject to appeal; (4) they are required to be considered in connection with periodic within-grade salary advancements; (5) they require within-grade salary reductions in accordance with regulations in cases of "Fair" ratings; (6) they require reassignment, demotion, or dismissal in accordance with regulations in cases of "Unsatisfactory" ratings; and (7) they are required to be considered in reduction in force. None of these characteristics apply to administrative-unofficial ratings which, while permissible under the efficiency rating system, are required only by administrative authority of the department or agency. There are three kinds of official ratings—regular, probational or trial period, and special ratings. Administrative-unofficial ratings are made under instructions issued by a department or agency to provide supplementary or other records of performance in such cases as when supervision changes, when an employee leaves the service, or when ratings are desired more frequently than once a year as during probational or trial periods.

SECTION 3. *Official ratings—regular ratings, when made, and periods of service considered.*—Regular ratings are to be made as of March 31 of each year for all employees who are not serving a probational or trial period and who have worked in the department or agency at least 90 calendar days in the grade of the position held on that date. The period of service to be considered in the preparation of regular ratings is as follows:

- A. If employee has served in the same position for a whole year, service from April 1 should be considered.
- B. If employee has entered on duty after April 1 and no movement between positions of different grades has occurred, service from day of entrance on duty should be considered.
- C. If employee has moved during the rating year from one position to another position of the same grade, in the same agency, service in both positions should be considered.
- D. If employee has moved during the rating year from one position to another position of a different grade, service from the date

of entrance into the position of the grade held on March 31 should be considered if that period is 90 days or more; except that

1. If employee was assigned on detail to the position and the detail was followed by official action, moving the employee into the position during the year ending March 31, service during the rating year while the employee was on detail may also be considered.

2. If the change in grade did not involve any current change in duties or responsibilities but arose out of a reevaluation of the position (as might occur as a result of a classification survey or classification appeal), service during the rating year while the employee was performing those duties and responsibilities should be considered without regard to the date of the official change in grade.

E. If employee is not on active duty on March 31 due to leave without pay or furlough, service to the date when active duty stopped should be considered.

F. If it is not practicable or feasible to consider the period of service indicated in the above paragraphs, service rendered while the employee was under the supervision of the rating official may be considered, providing the period is at least 90 calendar days.

*SECTION 4. Official ratings—probational or trial period ratings, when made, and period of service considered.*—Official probational or trial period ratings are made primarily to assist in determining whether employees serving probational or trial periods should be retained, or dismissed because of failure to meet requirements as a part of the examination process. They are, therefore, to be made 60 days prior to the end of such periods. Regardless of the number of prior administrative-unofficial ratings that a department or agency may require to be made during such periods or the number of different positions or grades in which an employee may have served during such a period, service rendered from the beginning of the probational or trial period shall be considered. The reasonable work requirements of the position in which the employee is working on the rating date shall be used in rating his performance. No "Regular" (March 31) rating shall be made during any probational or trial period.

*SECTION 5. Official ratings—special ratings, when made, and period of service considered.*—A special rating is to be made when there is no appropriate current official rating and one is needed for an official action. A special rating shall not be made for the purpose of revising a prior official rating. Neither shall it be made to effect the summary dismissal or salary reduction of an employee. A special rating is official for all purposes even though it is for less than 90 days. The service rendered by the employee while in the agency in the position held on the date the special rating is made shall be considered.

*SECTION 6. The rating official—designation.*—The rating official shall be the person who is immediately responsible for the work of the employee (first person in authority who has supervisory responsibilities), who either daily oversees, reviews, and checks the work of that employee, or who is most closely acquainted with his daily performance during the period of time for which the rating is made. In the case where an employee is regularly working under more than

one rating official, the rating officials shall confer and arrive at a report of efficiency rating which shall represent their joint evaluation under their joint signatures as rating official. If this procedure is not feasible, one shall be designated as the rating official and the others shall independently prepare reports of efficiency ratings for the consideration of the designated rating official.

**SECTION 7. *The rating official—rating responsibilities.***—The general responsibility of the rating official is to make the initial evaluation of the employee's performance. This is one of the most important operations in the rating process. The success of the program depends upon initial evaluations that are honest and unbiased, fair alike to the Government and the employee. The rating official is to follow the specific instructions in the Rating Official's Guide, Civil Service Commission Form No. 3823A, which is to be considered a part of this manual. Among supplementary instructions that may be issued by the head of a department or agency may be the requirement for specific evidence of outstanding or weak performance. The requirement may, of course, be restricted to the cases in which the adjective rating is "Excellent" or "Unsatisfactory." If specific evidences are required under departmental instructions, they may be written on a separate sheet and attached to the efficiency rating form, or they may be written on the back of the form.

**SECTION 8. *The reviewing official—designation.***—The reviewing official shall be the supervisor highest in line of authority above the rating official who has personal knowledge of the general performance of the employee to be rated and of the standards of performance of the unit in which the employee is assigned as compared with standards in other units.

**SECTION 9. *The reviewing official—reviewing responsibilities.***—The general responsibility of the reviewing official is to review or to revise ratings after conferring with rating officials and any intermediate supervisors. Reviewing officials may find it desirable to have ratings routed through intermediate supervisors. The reviewing official is the one on whom the efficiency rating committee must rely in making certain that proper and uniform standards have been applied by all the rating officials under his jurisdiction. It is expected, therefore, that he will avail himself of all the advice and guidance he can get from intermediate supervisors. He should read carefully the instructions in the Rating Official's Guide, Civil Service Commission Form No. 3823A, and see that they are followed. Specific instructions and suggestions, applicable to reviewing officials are as follows:

A. In order that rating officials may have a more uniform conception of the rating standards and procedure, it is suggested that the reviewing official discuss these matters with them before the ratings are made. Such a meeting will help to clarify any questions which may not be fully understood.

B. After receiving all completed forms from the rating officials, the reviewing official should examine the ratings by grade and class. Markings made by rating officials may be questioned for one of the following reasons or for some other reason:

1. Disagreement with the rating official as to elements that are pertinent to the position and therefore to be rated, or as to elements that are especially important and therefore to be underlined.

2. Based upon a personal knowledge of a particular employee's performance, disagreement with the evaluations made, either because of the evaluation itself, or because consistent performance requirements for that kind and level of work were not applied.

3. Disagreement with the adjective rating arrived at by the rating official because he has not followed the rating standard and has not provided a satisfactory explanation for deviating from the standard, or because he has not evaluated correctly and qualitatively the plus and minus marks in determining whether the minus marks have been overcompensated by plus marks.

C. Whenever there are disagreements with the rating official, the differences should be discussed with him and with the intermediate supervisors. Every possible effort should be made to arrive at a rating satisfactory to all. However, if an agreement with the rating official cannot be reached, the reviewing official should record his changes on the form in red ink without crossing out or erasing the marks of the initial rater.

D. When the review of the ratings is completed and the reviewing official is confident that rating instructions and standards have been followed, the adjective efficiency rating is to be written in the blank space provided for him. Then the reviewing official should write legibly in ink his name, title, and the date of his signature in the blank spaces at the bottom of the rating forms after the words "reviewed by," and submit the efficiency ratings to the efficiency rating committee.

**SECTION 10. Efficiency rating committee—designation.**—Each department, independent establishment, and other agency shall create one or more standing efficiency rating committees. An efficiency rating committee shall consist of members, usually three or five in number, designated by the head of the organization or other official authorized by him to act in such matters, such as the Director of Personnel. Each committee should be representative of divisions or units of the organization served and should include a member engaged in personnel administration.

**SECTION 11. Efficiency rating committee—responsibilities.**—The efficiency rating committee operates in a staff capacity for the head of the agency and the Director of Personnel in applying rating standards uniformly to all employees in the agency consistent with the standards of the efficiency rating system. Members of the efficiency rating committee should study the instructions to rating officials (Rating Official's Guide) and to reviewing officials (Section 9 above) and see that they are followed. Additional instructions and suggestions for the efficiency rating committee are given below:

A. Performance requirements: The efficiency rating committee should encourage administrative and supervisory officials, after consultation with employees, to determine, as far as practicable, the performance that should reasonably be required in the various kinds and levels of work for use in rating, and to report these determinations to the efficiency rating committee for its use in the approving of ratings.

B. Training programs: The efficiency rating committee should encourage and participate in training programs for rating and reviewing officials to establish a common understanding of their rating duties and responsibilities. The committee will need the cooperation of all rating and reviewing officials and should encourage and participate in round-table conferences where both policy and procedure will be discussed freely and where opportunity will be afforded for presenting questions and ideas regarding any phase of the rating program. It will probably be worth while to discuss the various elements of the rating form and their application to different types of positions. Throughout the entire program of training and preparing for actual rating, the primary objective—uniform standards in rating—should be strongly emphasized both to rating and reviewing officials.

C. Selection of pertinent and especially important elements: The rating and reviewing officials are primarily responsible for determining the pertinent and especially important elements for each kind and level of work. Elements to be rated should be the same for like positions. If, however, the efficiency rating committee is authorized to designate the elements, it shall determine the elements for each kind and level of work and have them indicated either on the form by encircling the numbers of the pertinent elements and underlining the especially important elements in black ink or in some other manner. However, if the rating official wants to add or delete elements or underlinings, he shall be permitted to do so, indicating his disagreements in red ink.

D. Advice and help: Before rating forms are distributed and during the period of actual rating and review, the committee is to be considered the source of information on questions of rating policy and procedure. Members of the committee individually and collectively must assume this responsibility, must keep currently informed of all aspects of the program, and must assist rating and reviewing officials in every possible way to expedite the efficiency rating program. If any problem or question arises which the committee is not able to answer, the matter should be referred to the Director of Personnel for his decision as promptly as possible. The committee shall not make evaluations for rating and reviewing officials, except in an appellate capacity if authorized, but shall serve in an advisory capacity on questions of procedure, rating standards, and meanings of terms.

E. Review and approval of ratings:

1. Instructions to rating and reviewing officials are also applicable to the efficiency rating committee. The efficiency rating committee shall review each official rating to make certain that the rating is the logical result of the markings on the elements.

2. It shall study the ratings submitted by rating officials and reviewing officials to learn whether the rating standards used and performance requirements were uniform as far as practicable. It is not desirable that the distribution of ratings in any grade and class or group of grades and classes be made to conform to any predetermined statistical scale. If the committee feels that the rating standards or performance requirements have not been applied uniformly as far as practicable, a conference should be held between the committee, or its representative, and

the rating and reviewing officials concerned. Any questionable rating shall be returned to the rating and reviewing officials for review and possible revision in accordance with the generally recognized standards. Every effort should be made to obtain the cooperation of the rating and reviewing officials.

3. If adjustments are clearly necessary to secure fairness and justice, and the cooperation of rating and reviewing officials concerned in making revisions cannot be secured after discussion in conference, the committee is authorized to adjust ratings.

4. After all ratings have been reviewed and any necessary revisions have been made, the committee shall have the date of approval and the adjective rating to be reported to the employee filled in on the form. The rating becomes an official record when it is approved by the committee.

**SECTION 12. *The Director of Personnel—responsibilities.***—The head of the agency is required by law to rate the performance of employees in accordance with the uniform efficiency rating system. To assist him in carrying out this responsibility, Section 6 of Executive Order No. 7916 of June 24, 1938, provides that the Director of Personnel should supervise the function of efficiency rating. This involves the following activities:

A. Establishing efficiency rating policies within the framework of the uniform efficiency rating system;

B. Seeing that efficiency rating committees are established and that they carry out their responsibilities;

C. Encouraging administrative and supervisory officials to determine, as far as practicable, the performance that should reasonably be required in the various kinds and levels of work;

D. Coordinating the efficiency rating program with personnel processes, and requiring appropriate action based on efficiency ratings according to rules and regulations;

E. Coordinating and advising efficiency rating committees in their instructional and training activities, and in the formulation of patterns of pertinent and especially important efficiency rating elements for the various classes of positions; and providing or making available the training and other facilities of the agency in the execution of such programs;

F. Establishing controls for securing the several types of efficiency ratings when due; seeing that instructions, manuals, and other material are issued and distributed; requisitioning efficiency rating forms and assisting in the distribution to the proper officials; and providing or arranging for adequate clerical assistance to efficiency rating committees;

G. Seeing that regulations regarding the recording of ratings, notification to employees, inspection of ratings by employees, and reporting of ratings to the Civil Service Commission are carried out, and maintaining custody of the approved efficiency ratings;

H. Administering any supplementary "administrative-unofficial" efficiency rating program established under administrative authority and regulation to provide records of performance in such cases as when supervision changes, when employee leaves, or when ratings are desired more frequently than once a year as during probational or trial periods.

## PART II. AIDS IN EFFICIENCY RATING ADMINISTRATION

Supplementary forms and procedures will be helpful in making the efficiency rating program effective in some departments, agencies, bureaus, and offices. Such aids should be employed to insure uniformity in the operation of the efficiency rating program and for the purpose of making the efficiency rating a valuable tool in the field of supervision. The aids outlined below have been developed by different agencies and proved successful under conditions and circumstances existing at the time of their use. They may be found useful to other agencies. Many other aids might be employed under other conditions and circumstances. No supplemental forms or procedures should be used unless they aid in the administration of the uniform efficiency rating program.

A. *Suggested check list.*—A check list is useful in helping rating and reviewing officials to make sure that rating forms are completely filled in before their transmittal to the efficiency rating committee. The committee may feel that questions similar to these should be incorporated into a memorandum to be sent to all rating and reviewing officials.

1. Do the classification symbols and office designation show the employee's current status?
2. Has the space at the top of the form been checked to show whether the rating is administrative-unofficial or official, regular, probational or trial period, or special?
3. Has the block on the right-hand side of the form been checked to designate whether the position of the employee is or is not of an administrative, supervisory, or planning nature?
4. Do the dates filled in at the top of the form show the exact period of time considered in the rating?
5. Have all the especially important elements in the position been underlined?
6. Has the administrative, supervisory, or planning employee been rated on all elements pertinent to his position whether in italics or not?
7. Has the "all others" employee been rated on all pertinent elements not in italics?
8. Has the question in element 13 "Is mark based on production records?" been answered with "Yes" or "No"?
9. Has the form been completed in ink (not in pencil)?
10. Does the assigned adjective rating conform to the "Standard" given on the form to be followed for consolidating the plus, minus, and check marks?
11. Has any deviation from the "Standard" been explained on the reverse side of the form under the signature of the official making the deviation?

12. Have both the rating and reviewing officials signed and dated the rating?

B. *Suggested schedule for completing the regular rating program.*—It is contemplated that official regular ratings prepared as of March 31 should be completed and available for official use in connection with administrative actions to be effective during the fiscal year beginning with July 1 of the same year. Since the ratings cannot be given official recognition until approved by the efficiency rating committee, a schedule similar to the one given below will be of material help in completing the regular rating program on time:

ON MARCH 1

Plans for conducting the program and supplemental instructions completed.

Rating forms requisitioned, assembled, and ready for distribution to rating officials.

MARCH 1 TO MARCH 15

Rating material distributed and meetings with rating and reviewing officials held.

MARCH 15 TO APRIL 7

Ratings made by rating officials and submitted to the reviewing officials.

APRIL 7 TO APRIL 15

Review of ratings completed by reviewing officials and submitted to the efficiency rating committee.

APRIL 15 TO MAY 15

Review of ratings accomplished by the efficiency rating committee and rating notices distributed to employees, and provision made for the inspection of ratings by employees.

MAY 15 TO JUNE 1

Report of ratings submitted to the Civil Service Commission.

C. *A plan for conducting a meeting with rating officials.*—Every department and independent establishment must realize the benefits which accrue from a program of intensive training of rating and reviewing officials. Direct benefits will be reaped in the form of better informed rating officials and closer adherence to rating standards, both of which result in an increase in the accuracy of the ratings. There are many ways of effectively conducting highly informative training meetings with rating officials. One plan which has been found satisfactory and which encourages discussion is given below:

1. Have a blank rating form enlarged by the photostatic process to an extent where it may be easily seen by everyone present at the meeting. Generally, an enlargement of 12 to 16 times the normal size of the form is sufficient. Mount this form on a large blackboard or piece of cardboard and place it in full view of the group.

Present to the group a hypothetical job description of a position in a class familiar to all members of the group. (Clerk-Stenographers make good examples.) Then, using this job description as a basis for rating, summarize the performance of two fictitious employees.

Now, direct the group's attention to the process of filling in the form. Indicate whether the ratings are Administrative-Unofficial or Official: Regular, Probational or Trial Period, or Special. Fill in the name, title, service and grade, bureau, etc., and check whether the position is or is not of an administrative, supervisory, or planning nature. Fill in the date at the top of the form and emphasize the necessity of showing the exact period considered in the rating. The period can be affected by the entrance-on-duty date, a change in grade or duties, an inter- or intra-departmental transfer, or a change in supervisors.

The next step, that of actually making the ratings, is, of course, the most important part of the whole demonstration. Every phase of the hypothetical performance of the two employees to be rated must be determined in advance. When selecting the pertinent elements and underlining those which are especially important, and marking the elements with plus, minus, and check marks, frequent reference should be made to the Rating Official's Guide, Civil Service Commission Form No. 3823A. Read and call attention to specific parts of the guide and the manual.

To stimulate discussion and maintain interest, encourage the group to discuss the factors that enter into the rating of each element. Inject some violations to the rating instructions into the ratings and raise some controversial questions in order to augment the discussion. (Take particular care, however, to see that each of these questions or violations is definitely cleared up before the meeting is over, and that no confusion or misunderstanding remains in the mind of anyone present.)

In arriving at the adjective rating, refer the group to the "Standard" on the rating form and determine which one most nearly fits the performance of each hypothetical employee.

In concluding the discussion of the two ratings, check your hypothetical ratings to be sure that the form is completely and accurately filled in. The functions of the reviewing official and efficiency rating committee should also be briefly reviewed.

*D. Suggested plan for discussion of ratings with employees.*—Since efficiency ratings serve as an important factor in the consideration of proposed personnel actions and will become a part of the permanent records of employees, the importance of having each employee thoroughly understand his rating cannot be exaggerated. In fact, the effectiveness of supervision and the success of the work program depend upon a thorough understanding between the supervisor and employee concerning the duties assigned, the performance requirements, and methods of attaining the desired performance. Frank discussions on these subjects should be held whenever necessary in order to develop and maintain the efficiency of every member of a working unit. Such discussions which include a consideration of the actual rating form will go far in achieving and cementing harmonious, cooperative relations in each unit and will result in more efficient operation of the organization.

In order to conduct effectively such an interview with the employee, the supervisor must recognize certain fundamental concepts. There is no need that the discussion be argumentative because at the outset there may be conflicting points of view. The supervisor should not attempt to dominate the employee by reason of his position. The approach should be on the basis of an open-minded discussion of the requirements of the job and how the employee can best adjust himself in meeting these requirements. Outlined below are some suggestions which supervisors may find helpful in discussing efficiency ratings with their employees:

### *Preparing for the interview.*

1. Review the factors which entered into your evaluation of the employee's performance.
  - a. Review the rating form to recall why he was rated as he was.
  - b. Keep the important aspects of his job in mind.
  - c. Review and have available for illustration any factual data which helped to determine the rating.
2. Organize a simple straightforward plan for conducting the discussion.
  - a. Adapt plan to personality of employee and to his point of view.
  - b. Consider any particular circumstances which affected the employee's rating.
  - c. If the rating has in any way changed from the employee's last one, be prepared to give an adequate explanation. In some cases, it may be advisable to show the employee his previous rating for comparison.
3. Select a time when both you and the employee are not under undue strain or pressure of work.
4. Provide for privacy during interview.

### *The interview.*

1. Put the employee at ease by some friendly remarks not necessarily about the rating to be discussed.
2. Discuss first the values of the efficiency rating, emphasizing the values to the employee himself. Then briefly review the definitions of the plus, minus, and check marks.
3. Discuss the completed rating form with the employee.
  - a. Go over with the employee the evaluations which you made of his performance in each of the pertinent elements in his position.
  - b. Show him which elements were especially important in his position and why he was given the rating he received with reference to the standard.
4. Manner during interview.
  - a. Maintain calm and unemotional attitude.
  - b. Do not put the employee on the defensive.
  - c. Talk in terms of the employee's experience.
  - d. Face the facts but show a sincere interest in the employee's work and his problems.
  - e. Be honest, frank, and judicial.

f. Give praise where praise is warranted, and criticize straightforwardly and constructively so that the employee knows where he stands.

*Concluding the interview.*

1. Give the employee an opportunity to speak freely, to ask questions, and to make suggestions.
  - a. If he has a problem and wants advice, suggest several possible solutions.
  - b. Do not let the discussion become argumentative.
  - c. Be sure the employee has a definite understanding of the performance requirements of his position.
2. Outline various methods which the employee may utilize to attain self-improvement. Work out a definite time-schedule with the employee which he agrees to follow in order to improve his efficiency. (In cases where serious deficiencies are to be corrected, this time-schedule should be followed up to see that definite improvement is made in accordance with the agreement and that the matter is not permitted to drift until the next regular rating date.)
3. Do not try to force the employee to agree with your evaluation of his performance.
4. Do not divulge the ratings of other employees or discuss their performance.
5. It may be well to make a record of the interview for future reference or for use during the next rating period; if your impressions are recorded immediately following the interview, the record will be more accurate.

## APPENDIX A

### Legislative and Executive Authority for the Efficiency Rating System

A. Section 9 of the Classification Act, approved March 4, 1923, as amended, provides:

"That the Board (now the Civil Service Commission, Sec. 505, Title V, Part II, of the 'Economy Act,' approved June 30, 1932) shall review and may revise uniform systems of efficiency ratings established or to be established for the various grades or classes thereof, which shall set forth the degree of efficiency which shall constitute ground for (a) increase in the rate of compensation for employees who have not attained the maximum rate of the class to which their positions are allocated, (b) continuance at the existing rate of compensation without increase or decrease, (c) decrease in the rate of compensation for employees who at the time are above the minimum rate for the class to which their positions are allocated and (d) dismissal.

"The head of each department shall rate in accordance with such systems the efficiency of each employee under his control or direction. The current ratings for each grade or class thereof shall be open to inspection by the representatives of the Board and by the employees of the department under conditions to be determined by the Board after consultation with the department heads.

"Reductions in compensation and dismissals for inefficiency shall be made by heads of departments in all cases whenever the efficiency ratings warrant, as provided herein, subject to the approval of the Board.

"The Board may require that one copy of such current ratings shall be transmitted to and kept on file with the Board."

B. Section 3 of the Mead-Ramspeck Act of August 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 614), provides:

"Section 9 of said Act (Classification Act of 1923, as amended) is hereby amended by adding thereto the following paragraph:

"The Civil Service Commission and heads of departments are authorized and directed to take such action as will apply the provisions of this section uniformly to all employees occupying positions within the compensation schedules fixed by this Act as nearly as is practicable."

C. Section 2 (e) of the Mead-Ramspeck Act of August 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 613), provides:

"The term 'good' as used herein shall be defined in accordance with the systems of efficiency rating established pursuant to Section 9 of this Act (Classification Act of 1923, as amended)."

D. Section 1 (b) of Executive Order No. 8882, September 3, 1941, provides:

"Positions within the scope of the compensation schedules fixed by this Act (Classification Act of 1923, as amended) shall include all permanent positions, including positions in the field services, in the executive and legislative branches, in government-owned or government-controlled corporations, and in the municipal government of the District of Columbia, compensation of which has been fixed on a per annum basis, pursuant to the allocation of such positions to the appropriate grade either by the Civil Service Commission or by administrative action of the department or agency concerned, in accordance with the compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or the said schedules as adjusted by an authorized differential."

E. Section 2 of Executive Order No. 8842, August 1, 1941, provides in part:

". . . all employees whose positions are classified in accordance with the salary schedule contained in Executive Order No. 6746, who have not attained the maximum rate of compensation . . . shall be advanced in compensation . . . subject to the following conditions:

"(b) . . . The term 'good' shall have the meaning attributed to it in the system of efficiency rating approved by the Civil Service Commission for the agency concerned, and each agency affected by this order shall maintain such a system."

APPENDIX B

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

December 23, 1943.  
PC: ERA: JAO: NB

DEPARTMENT CIRCULAR NO. 458

(Superseding Departmental Circular No. 302, Revised, and  
Departmental Circular No. 302, Supplement No. 1)

Subject: Uniform Efficiency Rating System, revision, effective January 1, 1944.

*To Heads of Departments and Independent Establishments:*

1. *Development and general nature of revisions.*—During the past two years, officials of the various departments and agencies and the Civil Service Commission have had an opportunity to see how the efficiency rating system that has been in force since March 31, 1942, and the optional modifications to the system have worked, its values, and its faults. As requested, suggestions and criticisms have been submitted to the Commission both from departmental and field service employees and officials. These have been given careful consideration. Possible modifications and improvements have been discussed by the Council of Personnel Administration and the Management-Labor Advisory Committee, and their recommendations have been received. Considering the different experiences with efficiency rating administration in the various departments and agencies of the Federal government and the different points of view of individuals and groups, it is to be expected that many of the suggestions and recommendations would be in conflict and that those accepted might not be fully acceptable to every department, agency, group, or individual. However, the suggestions and recommendations that have been accepted represent general agreement. There is no feeling that, with its improvements, the efficiency rating system as now revised is a perfect system. It will continue under observation and study, and suggestions and criticisms arising out of further experience will continue to be considered in accordance with the fundamental fact that the system must be adapted to existing conditions and developments if it is to be useful and effective.

General agreement has been reached on the following revisions which are now being put into effect:

1. Standardization of requirement for element markings.
2. Elimination of requirement for less than 90-day ratings.
3. Elimination of numerical ratings.

4. Elimination of the conduct report from the efficiency rating form.
5. Modification of requirements for interim, information and probationary or trial period ratings.
6. Restatement of language in the manual for greater clarity.
7. Clarification in the manual of the functions of the Director of Personnel in efficiency rating administration.
8. Preparation of a rating official's guide for distribution to all rating officials.

Matters that were considered but did not receive general acceptance at this time related to reduction in the number of adjective ratings, restatement of elements on the rating form with a possible reduction in the number of elements listed, grouping of elements under major headings, elimination of the underlining of especially important elements, and other less drastic suggestions. These matters require more study, and it was decided that they should not prevent the making of the improvements in time for the next regular rating program.

2. *Promulgation of revisions.*—Under legislative and executive authority and direction, the uniform efficiency rating system, described in the Efficiency Rating Manual, Form 3823, Revised, and the Rating Official's Guide, Form 3823A, covers all positions in the field and departmental services which are allocated under the compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and in accordance with Executive Order No. 6746. (See Sec. 9 of the Classification Act, as amended; Sec. 3 of the Act of August 1, 1941, 55 Stat. 614; Executive Order No. 8882 of September 3, 1941; and Executive Order No. 8842 of August 1, 1941.)

In order to carry out these authorizations and directions more effectively, particularly in the light of experience, the Civil Service Commission has revised the uniform efficiency rating system and directs that the administration of the efficiency rating program in departments and agencies shall be carried out in accordance with the system as revised and set forth in the Efficiency Rating Manual, Form 3823, Revised; the Report of Efficiency Rating, Standard Form No. 51, Revised; and the Rating Official's Guide, Form 3823A. A copy of the Rating Official's Guide, Form 3823A, shall be given to every supervisor who acts as a rating official. Supplementary instructions prepared by departments and agencies shall be consistent with the approved uniform efficiency rating system and copies shall be submitted to the Civil Service Commission.

3. *Additional regulations to be issued later.*—Additional regulations prescribing methods and procedures for (1) recording of efficiency ratings for administrative use, (2) notification to employees of ratings, (3) inspection of ratings by employees, and (4) reporting of ratings to the Civil Service Commission, will be issued prior to March 31, 1944. No supplementary instructions shall be issued by departments and agencies concerning these matters until the uniform regulations are promulgated.

4. *Periodic salary advancements.*—Section 7 of the Classification Act, as amended by the Act of August 1, 1941, provides for successive salary advancements based on several factors, one of which is efficiency ratings. Ratings of "Good" permit periodic salary advancement by successive steps up to and including the middle rate for the grade (the

fourth step in six-rate grades), and ratings of "Very Good" and "Excellent" permit periodic salary advancement by successive steps above the middle rate of the grade. This is in accordance with the principle that standard work performance is worth standard pay and that higher levels of work performance are worth higher rates of pay. Periodic salary advancement under the law and regulations are made by departments and agencies without review by the Commission.

5. *Salary reductions, demotions, or dismissals.*—Section 9 of the Classification Act, as amended, requires that "Reductions in compensation and dismissals for inefficiency shall be made by heads of departments in all cases whenever the efficiency ratings warrant," subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commission. Such actions shall be taken in conformity with the rules stated below. All salary reductions, demotions and dismissals required under these rules shall be reported to the Civil Service Commission and, with respect to employees in the departmental service, shall be deferred until the Commission's approval is formally given; except that, such reports and prior approval are not required with respect to employees serving probational or trial periods.

- a. No administrative or unofficial efficiency rating shall be used as a basis for taking action under these rules.
- b. The rate of compensation of an employee whose official efficiency rating is "Fair" shall be reduced one salary step if his rate of compensation is above the middle rate. If the rate of compensation is equal to or below such middle salary rate, it shall not be subject to reduction on that account.
- c. An employee whose official efficiency rating is "Unsatisfactory" shall not be permitted to remain in his position. He may be assigned to a position more nearly commensurate with his ability, either (1) in the same line of work, in which case the position shall be in a lower classification grade and his rate of compensation shall not be in excess of the middle rate for such grade, or (2) in some other line of work for which he is qualified, in which case he shall be considered as having received a new appointment to the extent that his rate of compensation shall be at the minimum rate for such grade and he shall begin a new probational or trial period; or if no suitable vacancy is available he shall be separated from the service for inefficiency. A probational or trial period employee, assigned to a position of lower classification grade, shall begin a new probational or trial period in the new position.
- d. For the purposes of the above rules, the fourth salary rate shall be considered the middle rate in any grade which has six salary rates.
- e. Employees shall be notified of any anticipated action under these rules in advance of the effective date of such action. Insofar as feasible, at least thirty days' notice is recommended.

6. *Contact office in Civil Service Commission.*—All correspondence to the Civil Service Commission concerning the uniform efficiency rating system should be addressed for the attention of the Efficiency Ratings Administration Section of the Personnel Classification Division.

7. *Previous circulars and other material superseded.*—Effective January 1, 1944, the Efficiency Rating Manual, Form 3823, issued January, 1942, Departmental Circulars No. 302 (Revised) of Novem-

Approved For Release 2001/07/25 : CIA-RDP57-00384R000500090007-37  
EFFICIENCY RATING MANUAL

ber 20, 1942, and No. 302, Supplement No. 1 of April 16, 1942, the Report of Efficiency Rating, Standard Form No. 51, approved January 5, 1942, and the List of Efficiency Ratings, Standard Form No. 52, approved January 5, 1942, are superseded.

By direction of the Commission:

Very respectfully,  
L. A. MOYER,  
*Executive Director and Chief Examiner.*

Standard Form No. 81, Rev.  
 Approved Dec. 1945  
 C. S. C. Dept. Cir. No. 448

Form approved  
 Budget Bureau No. 50-R012  
 Approval expires Mar. 20, 1946.

ADMINISTRATIVE-UNOFFICIAL ( )  
 OFFICIAL ( )  
 REGULAR ( )  
 PENSIONAL ( )  
 SPECIAL ( )  
 TRIAL PERIOD ( )

## REPORT OF EFFICIENCY RATING

As of ..... based on performance during period from ..... to .....

(Name of employee) ..... (Title of position, service, and grade)

(Organization—Indicate bureau, division, section, unit, field station)

ON LINES BELOW MARK EMPLOYEE	1. Study the instructions in the Rating Official's Guide, C. S. C. Form No. 3823A. 2. Underline the elements which are especially important in the position. 3. Rate only on elements pertinent to the position. a. Do not rate on elements in <i>italics</i> except for employees in administrative, supervisory, or planning positions. b. Rate administrative, supervisory, and planning functions on elements in <i>italics</i> .	CHECK ONE:  Administrative, supervisory, or planning ..... <input type="checkbox"/> All others ..... <input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

..... (1) Maintenance of equipment, tools, instruments.  
 ..... (2) Mechanical skill.  
 ..... (3) Skill in the application of techniques and procedures.  
 ..... (4) Presentability of work (appropriateness of arrangement and appearance of work).  
 ..... (5) Attention to broad phases of assignments.  
 ..... (6) Attention to pertinent detail.  
 ..... (7) Accuracy of operations.  
 ..... (8) Accuracy of final results.  
 ..... (9) Accuracy of judgments or decisions.  
 ..... (10) Effectiveness in presenting ideas or facts.  
 ..... (11) Industry.  
 ..... (12) Rate of progress on or completion of assignments.  
 ..... (13) Amount of acceptable work produced. (Is mark based on production records? ..... (Yes or no) )  
 ..... (14) Ability to organize his work.  
 ..... (15) Effectiveness in meeting and dealing with others.  
 ..... (16) Cooperativeness.  
 ..... (17) Initiative.  
 ..... (18) Resourcefulness.  
 ..... (19) Dependability.  
 ..... (20) Physical fitness for the work.

### STATE ANY OTHER ELEMENTS CONSIDERED

..... (A) .....  
 ..... (B) .....  
 ..... (C) .....

STANDARD  
 Deviations must be explained on reverse side of this form

Plus marks on all underlined elements, and no minus marks. ....  
 Plus marks on at least half of the underlined elements, and no minus marks. ....  
 Check marks or better on a majority of underlined elements, and any minus marks overcompensated by plus marks. ....  
 Check marks or better on a majority of underlined elements, and minus marks not overcompensated by plus marks. ....  
 Minus marks on at least half of the underlined elements. ....

Adjective rating	Rating official
Excellent	.....
Very good	.....
Good	Reviewing official. ....
Fair	.....
Unsatisfactory	.....

Rated by ..... (Signature of rating official) ..... (Title) ..... (Date)  
 Reviewed by ..... (Signature of reviewing official) ..... (Title) ..... (Date)  
 Rating approved by efficiency rating committee ..... (Date) Report to employee ..... (Adjective rating)

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 16-26177-2